

**Summary of Plenary Group Comments on  
Cultural Resources Work Group Resource Action Recommendations**

| <b>Resource Action<br/>(CRWG#)</b> | <b>Comments</b>  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| General                            | <p>Question: Is the separation of PM vs. E largely a jurisdictional distinction?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p>  |
|                                    | <p>Question: Are elements of the education program separated by priority?</p> <p>Answer: Yes</p>   |
| 1                                  | <p>Question: Is there a plan to re-locate car-top boat ramp within Foreman Creek area?</p> <p>Answer: Yes, also depends on study information; looking at joint/shared-use approach; goal is to maintain access while protecting sites</p>  |
| 3                                  | <p>Question: Is there a plan to re-locate boat launch ramp at Enterprise? Might Recreation and Cultural mutually benefit?</p> <p>Answer: See answer above Extending the current boat ramp is also under consideration.</p>   |
| General                            | <p>Question: What does the National Historic Preservation Act require?</p> <p>Answer: It calls on us to measure the quality of each resource against specific criteria; C-2 studies address these issues; study plans are available online</p>                                       |
|                                    | <p>Question: Is there a location proposed for the Heritage center?</p> <p>Answer: Not known yet, intention is to develop within collaborative; cross-resource discussion needed</p>  |
| 12                                 | <p>Question: What would be the goal for restoring the natural springs?</p> <p>Answer: Frances Kelley replied that the natural springs are of historic significance; produced wonderful water in the past; goal would be to clean them up and restore them</p>                        |
| 30                                 | <p>Question: Sources for funding for complex? Are the Tribes willing to kick in?</p> <p>Answer: No specific location identified yet. No decision made on any particular item. When proceeding, joint funding will be considered. (Valerie Fischer-Gates indicated she knows of a</p> |

|         |   |
|---------|---|
|         | <p>funding source.) One participant feels it should not be the Tribes' responsibility to provide funding. Some Tribes have initiated sharing voluntarily. (Repatriation is separate from the cultural center; on a separate track.) Does community want joint funding sources?</p>  |
| 15/10   | <p>Question: If funding a resource action, or an internal action between agencies, where would the funding come from?</p> <p>Answer: DWR may explore available options for analysis, negotiation defines funding for array of options; RAs are proposals supported by CRWG but are not yet agreed to by DWR</p>   |
| General | <p>Question: Are non-Tribal issues addressed in Resource Actions?</p> <p>Answer: Resource Actions address Historic and Prehistoric resources. Identified resources will get the attention they need. Study results are needed.</p>  |
| General | <p>October 30 at 2 p.m., there will be a meeting prior to the Recreation meeting sponsored by Eric Zigas.</p>   |
| 28      | <p>Question: What modifications to the Wildlife Habitat Management Program are proposed?</p> <p>Answer: Modify current bass habitat measures (e.g., placement of tires and Christmas trees) that impact Cultural sites.</p>   |
| General | <p>Question: Is the Maidu Advisory Council part of the RA discussions?</p> <p>Answer: Several representatives of the three federally recognized Oroville Tribes were involved with the MAC and invited to continue; three Tribes do not consider MAC a vehicle for government-to-government relationship, but MAC as a forum for information exchange; non-federally-recognized Tribes feel there is value in continuation of forum</p> |
| General | <p>Question: Did Tribes agree to prioritization, cultural center?</p> <p>Answer: Notified Art Angle that the CRWG was submitting a RA; initially, tribes agreed to put together RA; then moved to different discussion; DWR added RA anticipating their request, leaving it open for implementation; some tribes have other priorities</p>  |
| General | <p>Question: What is the next step?</p> <p>Answer: Work group-to-work group meetings may define range of possibilities; site suitability studies will further define range; legal/access concerns; take work group/technical recommendations and secure Plenary Group comment to ask whether these should be included in DWR analysis. Comments will help strengthen RAs.</p>   |

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| General | <p>Question: Will Tribes be involved in cross-resource discussions?</p> <p>Answer: Imagine WG will issue invitations and those interested will respond. DWR staff will be communicating results of cross-resource discussions to Tribes, as well.</p>   |
| 14      | <p>Question: Why not a broader approach? [than funding for Associate Park Archaeologist]</p> <p>Answer: CRWG 14 was written by DPR, but there may be broader options. See #6; another option could rely on trained laypersons, could incorporate Native Americans. #14 is an element of #6. Pre-Historic and Historic Archaeologist. Study Plan C3 - HPMP will provide options for managing cultural resources for the term of the license (30-50 years).</p> |